



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Even if the moral effect of the example failed, economic forces would compel the adoption of a like course in Europe, because nations burdened by the present scale of armaments could not long hope to maintain their place in the race with nations free of such load. Along this line Canada may do much to hasten the time when battle flags shall be forever furled and war drums shall no longer alarm. In promoting such action on the part of the Dominion each citizen may perform, in its highest and best sense, a really patriotic service.

### Laying the Foundation Deep.

BY BRADLEY GILMAN.

The signs of the times point clearly to the steady and rapid approach of a general system of international arbitration. Not only has the past decade shown a larger number of disputes peacefully and equitably settled than during the previous half century, but the past year — yes, even the recent half year — is replete with indications that world-opinion is swinging powerfully toward peaceful solutions of all international questions. The very word "peace" is seen in the pages of the daily press and in the monthly magazines far more frequently than formerly. The editorials of our leading journals lend their influence toward the peaceful solution of international disputes rather than to wanton bloodshed and economic waste. Even the humorous papers, and the humorous paragraphs of the serious journals, frequently assume, as the crux of their wit and humor, that war is discredited and an anachronism.

To one who looks for these unconscious testimonials to the advance of the peace movement, the gratifying conclusion is very evident: the peace idea is taking root in the minds and hearts of men of all nations. Not only do men like Edwin Ginn and Andrew Carnegie nobly evince their belief in the soundness of "the idea," and President Taft and Edward Grey show their acceptance of it, but the people at large, the "men on the street," are also awaking as from a dream, and asking themselves and their fellows, "Why this waste of blood and treasure? Need it be?"

Thus among high officials, and among the "plain people" who give to them their official power, "the peace idea" is taking root; but we must remember that, although presidents and cabinet ministers and senates may seem to be achieving much in their formal overtures one to another, and apart from the people, yet it is really by the will of the people that an enduring condition of world-peace is to be maintained; the great masses of the people must become imbued with the desire for arbitration, else when strained conditions between two or more countries arise the compacts and treaties of high officials — individuals or august assemblies — will be snapped like tow threads, and the clamor will be inevitably for war. This was what led us into the Spanish War. President McKinley was for peace, and other wise and humane advisers stood with him; but the populace — and unscrupulous journals who voiced the feverish popular demands — forced the hands of our leaders and brought us into war.

Hence it must be remembered that, although we rejoice in the friendly stretching out of high official hands across the seas, we must prosecute an earnest campaign of edu-

cation among the plain people. Almost any treaty or *entente* will hold when there is no irritation or seeming injustice in international relations; but during this period of calm we must establish deeply in the minds and hearts of the plain people of all civilized nations a belief in arbitration; then when friction arises, and heated rantings of demagogues and yellow journals tend toward war, the peace idea will still hold the people at large; and they will be loyal, in stress and storm, to the high ideal which they have welcomed and affirmed in the days of their calm, deliberate judgment.

### A World Court.

BY CHARLES RICHARDSON.

The failure of the second Hague Conference to unite upon a method for selecting judges for a World Court, and the apparently insurmountable difficulties which caused that failure, have resulted very naturally in a tendency to favor the creation of a court by a small group of the larger powers without the assent or participation of the other and much more numerous nations. While this would undoubtedly be a long step in advance of present conditions, the court agreed upon at The Hague would be so much more useful and influential that the hope of securing it should not be abandoned without further efforts.

The influence and success of an international court must necessarily depend upon the extent to which it can obtain the support of that intangible, but almost omnipotent, force known as public opinion, or the opinions of mankind, and it is obvious that a court controlled by a small group of nations could not obtain that support to anything like the same degree as one in which all, or nearly all, the nations were satisfactorily represented.

In the countries excluded from any share in the formation of such a court there would probably be something analogous to the anti-class feeling with which the majority of Americans would regard a court in which all the judges were selected by Wall Street bankers or corporation lawyers.

A large proportion of international differences are between strong nations and weak ones, and in such cases there would be no court with jurisdiction over both parties, and neither the parties themselves, nor the people of other countries, could have confidence in the impartiality of a court controlled entirely by a few of the most powerful nations.

The creation of such a court would probably lead to the formation of a similar court or courts by some other group or groups of nations, and then there would be conflicting decisions with no provision for their appeal or correction. But whether there should be one court or several, so long as there should be no supreme tribunal which could be regarded as representing all the nations, the lack of it would continue to be urged as a conclusive argument for great armies and navies.

With these considerations in mind, it seems to be an imperative duty to reexamine the difficulty which the Hague Conference failed to overcome in its project for a world court. Stated briefly, that difficulty consisted in the conflicting claims of the small and large states. The former were determined that each state should appoint one judge, while the latter insisted that no such arrangement could ever be accepted.

At first sight it seems impossible to harmonize such opposite views. But an examination of the motives of those who urged them may make the case seem more hopeful. The small states had two reasons for the position they took. One was their belief that no sovereign state could afford to admit inferiority in international rights or duties; the other was the fear that they might fail to obtain exact justice in a court dominated by the great powers. The large states had also two reasons for their action. One was the obvious fact that a court of forty-five judges would be entirely too large; the other was a fear of injustice in a court where a large majority of the judges had been selected by the smaller powers. If this is a correct analysis of the underlying causes of the difficulty, and a satisfactory method of disposing of them can be found, it will seem reasonable to think that it may lead to the great achievement which the Hague Conference hoped for when it adjourned.

The accompanying suggestion has been recently made by the writer of this article as an effort in this direction. It meets the four causes of the difficulty as follows:

1. It provides what the small nations demanded,—equality in the selection of the judges.
2. It provides for a court of reasonable size, namely, fifteen judges.
3. By its requirement that every decision must have an assent from one or more judges of *each group*, it protects both large and small nations from the danger of adverse influences due to nations much larger or much smaller than themselves.

In its simplest form, without the author's notes as to possible alterations in minor details and methods, the suggestion is:

1. That the nations shall be divided into three groups, the largest nations in one group, the smallest in another group, and the intermediate nations in a third group; but each group to have an equal number of nations.
2. That each of the three groups shall appoint five judges, and that every decision by the court must have the assent of one or more judges from *each group*.

Philadelphia, Pa.

### **The Visit of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant to Salt Lake City and the Peace Movement in Utah.**

BY PROF. TORILD ARNOLDSON.

The short visit of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant to Salt Lake City is a memorable event in the history of the peace movement in the State of Utah.

The Baron arrived on the 13th of April at noon, and was met at the station by a delegation from the Utah State Peace Society. From there he was taken to the Tabernacle, where the authorities of the Mormon Church had arranged a special organ recital in honor of the distinguished guest. At one o'clock he proceeded to the State University, where he was given a rousing ovation by faculty and students, who crowded the auditorium to its utmost capacity.

The subject of the Baron's discourse, impressive by its irresistible logic and cordiality, was general in its nature, but centered upon the pacific needs and aspirations of the United States. He paid a tribute to the American

government for giving the first practical recognition to the Hague Tribunal, and to Mr. Carnegie for establishing its dignity in the eyes of the world by the foundation of the Palace of Peace. He concluded by exhorting the young to emulate the past by adding to the heritage of liberty the realization of the reign of peace.

After the address the Baron and members of the Utah State Peace Society were entertained at a delicious luncheon by Bishop F. S. Spalding. In the informal conversation at the table the peace question naturally occupied a prominent place. Among other things, the Baron explained his position in regard to the fortification of the Panama Canal—this delicate question which has bewildered the minds of even avowed advocates of peace. National prejudice is rooted even in the noblest minds, but the Baron is singularly free from this limitation. While devoted to the cause of peace with all the power of a firm conviction, he deals with facts. His view of the Panama fortification question is not so much concerned with the wasteful discussion of the United States' eventual legal rights as rather with the inevitable results of such fortification, which can only be bad. The Baron added that he has come to the conclusion that all domination spells ruin, that history and human experience bear out this gospel truth, and that he is actually at work on a book in which he develops this idea.

The visit of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant will be a new incentive to the peace workers of our State. Another to which we look forward is the coming of Dr. James L. Tryon of Boston in the near future.

The people of Utah are setting a good example in their attitude to the peace movement. Her leading men are actively interested. Ex-Governor Cutler is president of the Peace Society, and the actual governor, Wm. Spry, honorary president; Dr. J. T. Kingsbury, president of the State University, is an ardent peace friend; and the authorities of the leading church, from the president down, heartily support every move of the peace advocates in the State. The same thing is true of many other denominations, Jews, Gentiles and Mormons alike. But the first and foremost honor is due to the Society's secretary, Mr. J. M. Sjordahl, who, with his genial, unassuming personality and his untiring, generous zeal, is the soul of the peace movement in Utah.

The University of Utah, April, 1911.

### **Friendship between Great Britain and the United States.**

#### **Great Mass Meeting at Buffalo.**

A notable demonstration of amity between the United States and Great Britain featured a Reciprocity Rally held at Buffalo, N. Y., U. S. A., on the evening of April 12. Three thousand citizens braved a severe storm to attend an address on "Buffalo, the World City," by Herbert N. Casson, a Canadian by birth. When he finished the Americans applauded vociferously. The presiding officer tried in vain to stop the clapping. Nevertheless, now growing faint, and then bursting forth again in full blast, it continued on for three whole minutes. Finally, when the ovation ceased, and as the silence contrasted with the thunder of applause just ended, the great organ burst into the strains of "God Save the King,"